



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/909,015

07/20/2001

Kazuhiro Sugawara

35.C15592

9096

5514

7590

04/01/2008

FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO  
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA  
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

KANG, PAUL H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2144

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

04/01/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/909,015	SUGAWARA, KAZUHIRO	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Paul H. Kang	2144	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Paul H. Kang, USPTO. (3)\_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Christian Mannino, Reg. No. 58,373. (4)\_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 26 March 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 49.

Identification of prior art discussed: Geiger et al. (USP 6,073,142) and Aronson et al. (USP 6,654,787).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: the claimed invention with respect to the prior art of record was discussed. Applicant stated the prior art failed to teach the claimed receiving unit, first obtaining unit, discriminating unit, and the size information as newly amended. The examiner disagreed and described the application of the prior art to the claimed invention. Further, the examiner noted the newly added limitation regarding the size information of the email is also taught by the prior art of record.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Paul H Kang/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2144

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required